arXiv:1108.4607v4 [cs.LO] 10 Dec 2011

On commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions

Tianrong Lin[a,*]

[a] *Dept. of Computer Science for GM Information College, Fukien University of Technology, Fuzhou 350014, China*

Abstract

In a recent letter by Ying et al. [Inf. Process. Lett. 104 (2007) 152-158], it has shown some sufficient conditions for commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions. However, the sufficient and necessary condition for quantum weakest preconditions remains open. This letter presents a simple characterization of the commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions. We show that, two quantum weakest preconditions $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$ and $wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$ commute if and only if the product $wp(\mathcal{E})(M) \cdot wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$ (or, $wp(\mathcal{E})(N) \cdot wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$) is Hermitian.

Keywords: Quantum program, Weakest precondition, Hermitian matrix, Commutativity

---

1. Introduction

Motivated by the famous quantum factoring algorithm [1] and searching algorithm [2], a substantial effort has been made to develop the theory of quantum computation.

As mentioned in [3], quantum algorithms, currently, are expressed at the

---

[*] Corresponding author. Tel.:+8618359133282

Email address: `tianrong671@yahoo.com.cn` (Tianrong Lin)

December 13, 2011

very low level of quantum quantum circuits. However, there exist some work [4–8] to study the design and semantics of quantum programming languages. In particular, D'Hondt and Panangaden [9] introduced a notion of quantum weakest precondition an a Stone-type duality between the state transition semantics and the predicate transformer semantics for quantum programs.

According to [8], quantum programs may be represented by super-operators. Following D'Hondt and Panangaden's approach [9], then, a quantum predicate is defined to be an observable, i.e., a Hermitian operator on the state space which can be viewed as a natural generalization of Kozen's probabilistic predicate as a measurable function [10].

Here, our main aim is to present a characterization, i.e., a sufficient and necessary condition, for the commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions. Concerning the significance of commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions, we refer to [3] (cf. [3], Paragraph 3).

The remainder of the letter is organized in the following way: the next section is devoted to review some basic definitions and useful propositions where the main result is introduced. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the main theorem and section 4 is the concluding section.

2. Basic definition and main result

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space. Recall that a density matrix ρ on $\mathcal{H}$ is a positive operator with $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho) \leq 1$[1] where Tr is the *trace* function[2]. The set of density operators on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. A super-operator on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a linear operator $\mathcal{E}$ from the space $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ into itself which the following are satisfied

---

[1] Following [8].

[2] Let $A = (a_{ij})_{n\times n}$ be a matrix, then $\mathrm{Tr}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ii}$.

- $\mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}(\rho)]\leq\mathrm{Tr}(\rho)$ for each $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$;
- Complete positivity: for any extra Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_R$, $(\mathcal{I}_R \otimes \mathcal{E})(A)$ is positive provided A is a positive operator on $\mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{I}_R$ is the identity operation on $\mathcal{H}_R$.

Following [3], the set of super-operators on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted $\mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$.

A quantum predicate on $\mathcal{H}$ is defined to be a Hermitian operator M with $0 \sqsubseteq$ [3] $M \sqsubseteq I$, and the set of quantum predicates on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$.

Definition 1 ([3], Definition 2.1). For any quantum predicates $M, N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, and for any quantum program $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$, M is called a precondition of N with respect to $\mathcal{E}$, written $M\{\mathcal{E}\}N$, if

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) \quad \leq \quad \mathrm{Tr}(N\mathcal{E}(\rho))$$

for all density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$.

Definition 2 ([3], Definition 2.2). Let $M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ be a quantum predicate and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$ a quantum program. Then the weakest precondition of M with respect to $\mathcal{E}$ is a quantum predicate $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$ satisfying the following conditons:

1. $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)\{\mathcal{E}\}M$;
2. for all quantum predicates N, $N\{\mathcal{E}\}M$ implies $N \sqsubseteq wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$.

The following Kraus operator-sum representation [11] of $wp(\mathcal{E})$ is needed in the sequel.

---

[3] The $\sqsubseteq$ denotes the Löwner ordering, i.e., $A \sqsubseteq B$ if $B - A$ is a positive operator.

Proposition 1 ([3], Proposition 2.1). *Suppose that $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$ is represented by the set $\{E_i\}$ of operators. Then for each $M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, we have*

$$wp(\mathcal{E})(M) \quad = \quad \sum_i E_i^\dagger M E_i.$$

Also, we have the following intrinsic characterization of $wp(\mathcal{E})$, attributed to Ying et al. [3], in the case that $\mathcal{E}$ is given by a system-environment model[4].

Proposition 2 ([3], Proposition 2.2). *If $\mathcal{E}$ is given in terms of system-environment model[5], then we have*

$$wp(\mathcal{E})(M) \quad = \quad \langle e_0|U^\dagger P(M \otimes I_E)PU|e_0\rangle$$

for each $M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, where I_E is the identity operator in the environment system.

We now turn to the formal definition of *Commutativity* for two operators. In general, for any two operators A and B on $\mathcal{H}$, it is said that A and B commute if $AB = BA$ [3]. In the sequel, what we concern is that: given a quantum program $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$, when do $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$ and $wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$ commute?

Here is the main result of this letter.

Theorem 3. *Let M, $N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ be two quantum predicates, and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$ a quantum program. Then $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$ and $wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$ commute iff the product $wp(\mathcal{E})(M) \cdot wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$ (or, $wp(\mathcal{E})(N) \cdot wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$) is Hermitian.*

---

[4] See [3].

[5] See [3], Eq. (1).

3. Proof of the main Theorem

To show the Theorem 3, the following Lemma is needed.

Lemma 4. *Let* $M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ *be a quantum predicate, and let* $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$ *be a quantum program. Then* $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$ *is Hermitian.*

Proof. Let A denote $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$, then by proposition 1,

$$\begin{aligned} A^\dagger &= \left(\sum_i E_i^\dagger M E_i\right)^\dagger = \sum_i \left(E_i^\dagger M E_i\right)^\dagger \\ &= \sum_i E_i^\dagger M^\dagger (E_i^\dagger)^\dagger = \sum_i E_i^\dagger M E_i \\ &= A \end{aligned}$$

as required. ■

Now, we can present the proof of Theorem 3 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let A denote $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$ and B denote $wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$, respectively. Then we show first the "if" part of the Theorem.

If AB is Hermitian, i.e., $(AB)^\dagger = AB$, then

$$\begin{aligned} AB &= (AB)^\dagger = B^\dagger A^\dagger \\ &= BA \qquad \text{(by } \textbf{Lemma 4}\text{)} \end{aligned}$$

We show next the "only if" part of the Theorem.

Assume that A and B commute, i.e., $AB = BA$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (AB)^\dagger &= B^\dagger A^\dagger = BA \qquad \text{(by } \textbf{Lemma 4}\text{)} \\ &= AB \qquad \text{(by Hypothesis)} \end{aligned}$$

as required. Theorem 3 follows. ■

4. Conclusions

In this letter, we give a characterization of the commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions. We show that, two quantum weakest preconditions $wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$ and $wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$ commute if and only if the product $wp(\mathcal{E})(M) \cdot wp(\mathcal{E})(N)$ (or, $wp(\mathcal{E})(N) \cdot wp(\mathcal{E})(M)$) is Hermitian. This answers an open problem of Ying et al. [3]. But our characterization is not in terms of $[M, N]$, i.e., the commutator of $M, N \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$. At the same time, the infinite-dimensional counterpart of the above question which proposed originally by Ying et al. [3] remains open. It is our further work to consider this problem.

References

[1] P.W. Shor, Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring, in: Proc. 35th IEEE Symp. on Foundatinos of Computer Science (FOCS), 1994, pp. 124-134.

[2] L. Grover, A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search, in: Proc. 28th ACM Symp. on the Theory of Computing (STOC), 1996, pp. 212-219.

[3] M.S. Ying, J.X. Chen, Y. Feng, R.Y. Duan, Commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions, Inf. Process. Lett. 104 (2007) 152-158.

[4] R. Chadha, P. Mateus, A. Sernadas, Reasoning about quantum imperative programs, Electronic Notes in Theoret. Comput. Sci., 158 (2006) 19-40.

[5] Y. Feng, R.Y. Duan, Z.F. Ji, M.S. Ying, Proof rules for correctness of quantum programs, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 386 (2007) 151-166.

[6] B. Ömer, A procedural formalism for quantum computing, Master's thesis, Dept. of theoretical Physics, Technical University of Vienna, July 1998.

[7] J.W. Sanders, P. Zuliani, Quantum programming, in: LNCS, vol. 1837, 2000, pp. 80-99.

[8] P. Selinger, Towards a quantum programming language, Math. Struct. in Comput. Sci., 14 (2004) 527-586.

[9] E. D'Hondt, P. Panangaden, Quantum weakest preconditions, Math. Struct. in Comput. Sci., 16 (2006) 429-451.

[10] D. Kozen, Semantics of probabilistic programs, J. Comput. System Sci. 22 (1981) 328-350.

[11] M.A. Nielsen, I.L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.